

Schwinger-Dyson approach to light pseudoscalars

D. Klabučar^a and D. Kekez^b

^aPhysics Department, Faculty of Science, Zagreb University, Bijenička c. 32,
HR-10000 Zagreb, Croatia

^bRudjer Bošković Institute, P.O.B. 180, HR-10002 Zagreb, Croatia

Abstract. We review briefly some of the successes of Schwinger-Dyson (SD) approach to the physics of quarks and hadrons, primarily light pseudoscalar mesons including η and η' . The main purpose of this paper is to point out that SD results on η and η' mesons can be formulated and given also in the two-mixing-angle scheme.

Schwinger-Dyson (SD) equations provide a nonperturbative, covariant and chirally well-behaved approach to quark-hadron physics. This approach [1, 2, 3] can be formulated so that it has strong and clear connections with QCD. Admittedly, coupled integral SD equations for Green's functions of QCD cannot be solved exactly since some truncation of the infinite system of SD equations is unavoidable. However, the numerous advances [1, 2, 3] achieved in this field within the last dozen or so years also include increased understanding of how to perform this truncation so that some important known behaviors are preserved. This includes the known perturbative QCD behavior and dynamical chiral symmetry breaking (D χ SB). The latter is crucial in low-energy QCD, especially for the description of the light-quark sector. The correct chiral behavior due to D χ SB can be achieved through the coupling of SD and Bethe-Salpeter (BS) equations in a consistent approximation. That is, one usually solves

$$S_q^{-1}(p) = \not{p} - m_q - ig^2 C_F \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} \gamma^\mu S_q(k) \gamma^\nu G_{\mu\nu}(p-k) , \quad (1)$$

the (rainbow-)ladder-approximated SD equation for “dressed” propagators, $S_q(p)$, of the light quarks $q = u, d, s$. The strong coupling constant is denoted by g and the color factor $C_F = 4/3$. The interaction $G_{\mu\nu}$ stands for an effective gluon propagator; it is known in the perturbative QCD regime, but has to be modeled in the nonperturbative regime, for low momenta, in order to be phenomenologically successful. The same “dressed” gluon exchange interaction $G_{\mu\nu}$ and the resulting solutions of Eq. (1) for light-quark propagators S_q , are

then employed in

$$S_q^{-1}(k + \frac{P}{2})\chi_{q\bar{q}'}(k, P)S_{q'}^{-1}(k - \frac{P}{2}) = ig^2 C_F \int \frac{d^4 k'}{(2\pi)^4} \gamma^\mu \chi_{q\bar{q}'}(k', P) \gamma^\nu G_{\mu\nu}(k - k') , \quad (2)$$

the ladder-approximated BS equations for various quark-antiquark ($q\bar{q}'$) BS amplitudes $\chi_{q\bar{q}'}$. This defines a chirally well-behaved SD-BS approach, in which light pseudoscalar meson $q\bar{q}$ bound states ($\pi^{0,\pm}, K^{0,\pm}, \eta$) in the chiral limit (and *close* to it) **simultaneously** manifest themselves also as (*quasi*-)Goldstone bosons of D χ SB. This enables one to work with the mesons as explicit $q\bar{q}$ bound states while reproducing analytically – in the chiral limit – the famous results of the Abelian axial anomaly for the light pseudoscalar mesons, namely the amplitudes for $\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ and $\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^0\pi^-$ [4]. This is unique among the bound state approaches – *e.g.*, see Refs. [2, 3, 5, 4] and references therein. Nevertheless, one keeps the advantage of bound state approaches that from the $q\bar{q}$ substructure one can calculate many important quantities such as meson decay constants (*e.g.*, f_π), which are just parameters in most of other chiral approaches to the light-quark sector. Also, one can depart far from the chiral limit, soft point and on-shell limit in the anomaly-related processes $\pi^0, \eta, \eta' \leftrightarrow \gamma\gamma$ and $\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^0\pi^-$, for example in Refs. [6, 7, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12] where the phenomenologically successful Munczek-Jain Ansatz [13] for the effective gluon propagator $G_{\mu\nu}$ was used. (This Ansatz is very similar to the interactions adopted, with small variations, in almost all recent phenomenologically most successful SD studies [1, 2, 3].) In this way obtained description of η - η' complex [7, 9, 10, 14, 11] is especially noteworthy, as it is very successful in spite of the limitations of the SD-BS approach in the ladder approximation, because of which Eqs. (1)-(2) cannot include the effects of gluon anomaly. They give only non-anomalous contributions to $q\bar{q}$ BS solutions and masses. Fortunately, gluon anomaly is suppressed as $1/N_c$ in the expansion in number of colors N_c , so that the procedure of Refs. [7, 9, 10, 15], which includes gluon anomaly only through parameterizing the anomalous shift of η_0 mass, leads to very satisfactory results. For example, our η - η' mass matrix is in agreement with phenomenology and lattice results. It can be seen it leads to a very good description of η - η' mixing, although it is formulated (except in Appendix of Ref. [9]) in terms of one *state* mixing angle, for example ϕ ,

$$|\eta\rangle = \cos\phi|\eta_{NS}\rangle - \sin\phi|\eta_S\rangle , \quad |\eta'\rangle = \sin\phi|\eta_{NS}\rangle + \cos\phi|\eta_S\rangle , \quad (3)$$

rotating the nonstrange-strange (NS - S) basis states η_{NS} and η_S to the mass eigenstates η and η' . In terms of the quark-antiquark states $|q\bar{q}\rangle$ ($q = u, d, s$), or the (effective, flavor-symmetry-broken) singlet-octet states η_8 and η_0 ,

$$|\eta_{NS}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|u\bar{u}\rangle + |d\bar{d}\rangle) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}|\eta_8\rangle + \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}|\eta_0\rangle , \quad (4)$$

$$|\eta_S\rangle = |s\bar{s}\rangle = -\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}|\eta_8\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}|\eta_0\rangle . \quad (5)$$

Although mathematically equivalent to the (*effective*) octet-singlet η_8 - η_0 basis (with its state mixing angle $\theta = \phi - \arctan\sqrt{2}$), the NS - S mixing basis

and its angle ϕ have the advantage that they offer the quickest way to show the consistency of our procedures and the corresponding results obtained using just one state mixing angle (be it θ or ϕ), with the **two-mixing-angle scheme**. This scheme (reviewed in, *e.g.*, Ref. [16]) is defined with respect to the mixing of the four decay constants f_η^8 , $f_{\eta'}^8$, f_η^0 , and $f_{\eta'}^0$, and results are parameterized in terms of two auxiliary decay constants f_0 , f_8 , and two angles θ_0 , θ_8 . However, phenomenology seems to justify the central assumption of Feldmann, Kroll and Stech (FKS) [17] that in the NS - S basis, the decay constants follow (in a good approximation) the pattern of particle state mixing. As a consequence, θ_8 , θ_0 , f_8 and f_0 can be expressed [17, 18, 16] through the single NS - S state mixing angle ϕ and f_{NS} , f_S , the respective decay constants of η_{NS} , η_S :

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_8 &= \phi - \arctan\left(\sqrt{2}f_S/f_{NS}\right), & \theta_0 &= \phi - \arctan\left(\sqrt{2}f_{NS}/f_S\right), \\ f_8 &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}f_{NS}^2 + \frac{2}{3}f_S^2}, & f_0 &= \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}f_{NS}^2 + \frac{1}{3}f_S^2},\end{aligned}\quad (6)$$

The relations (6)-(7) are applicable also in our SD-BS approach, as shown in detail in Appendix of Ref. [9]. This reference confirmed our earlier results [7] on the mixing angle, finding that the preferred NS - S state mixing angle in our SD-BS approach is $\phi \approx 42^\circ$, in good agreement with FKS results quoted in Refs. [17, 18, 16]. The values we find [9] for f_0 , f_8 , θ_0 and θ_8 are also similar to theirs. This is the consequence of our values of f_{NS} and f_S , which are calculated directly from $q\bar{q}$ substructure, *i.e.*, our SD and BS solutions. The ratio $y = f_{NS}/f_S$ is suitable for giving the extent of the $SU(3)$ breaking. Due to Goldberger-Treiman relation for constituent quarks, it is close to $\mathcal{M}_u/\mathcal{M}_s$, the ratio of the masses of the nonstrange and strange constituent quarks.

We get $f_{NS} \equiv f_\pi$ (theoretical FKS analysis [17, 16] assumes this), while our numerical calculation yields $f_S = 1.451f_\pi$, just 3% above the theoretical FKS prediction [17, 18, 16]. This leads to $f_8 = 1.318f_\pi$ and $f_0 = 1.170f_\pi$. (Interestingly, this is practically equal to our SD-BS model values $f_{\eta_8} = 1.31f_\pi$ and $f_{\eta_0} = 1.16f_\pi$ [7] for the octet and singlet axial-current decay constants f_{η_8} and f_{η_0} defined in the standard way through the matrix elements $\langle 0|A^{a\mu}|\eta_a\rangle$, ($a = 8, 0$), so that f_{η_8} and f_{η_0} are straightforwardly expressed through f_{NS} and f_S by the relations $f_{\eta_8} = \frac{1}{3}f_{NS} + \frac{2}{3}f_S$ and $f_{\eta_0} = \frac{2}{3}f_{NS} + \frac{1}{3}f_S$. We thus note that the quadratic relations (7) for differently defined octet and singlet constants f_8 and f_0 , lead to similar values as the linear relations for f_{η_8} and f_{η_0} .)

Using in Eqs. (6)-(7) our model predictions $\phi = 42^\circ$ and $y = f_{NS}/f_S = 0.689$, we get the following two decay-constant-mixing angles: $\theta_8 = -22^\circ$ and $\theta_0 = -2.3^\circ$, close to the theoretical FKS results [17, 18]. See also Table 1 in Ref. [16], line “FKS scheme & theory”, giving $\theta_8 = -21.0^\circ$ and $\theta_0 = -2.7^\circ$, while the line “FKS scheme & phenomenology” in this table has only somewhat more negative θ_0 but larger f_0/f_π . Up to corrections of order $(1 - y)^2$, the “FKS scheme & theory” implies the *effective* η_8 - η_0 state-mixing angle $\theta \approx (\theta_8 + \theta_0)/2 \approx -12^\circ$, in agreement with our results [9]. Notably, $\theta \approx -12^\circ$ agrees well with the mixing angle we get from our η - η' mass matrix, which agrees well with the NS - S mass matrices following from phenomenology and lattice

calculations, as commented in the pedagogical exposition [15]. Reference [15] also explains how our approach practically ensures the reproduction of the empirical NS - S mass matrix once SD-BS calculations successfully reproduce pion and kaon masses and pion decay constant, as only one more parameter is then needed to fit η and η' masses satisfactorily.

Acknowledgment: D. Klabučar thanks the organizers, B. Golli, R. Krivec, M. Rosina and S. Širca, for their hospitality and partial support enabling his participation at XVIII European Conference on Few-Body Problems in Physics.

References

1. For recent reviews and numerous references, see, *e.g.*, Refs. [2,3].
2. R. Alkofer and L. von Smekal, Phys. Rept. **353** (2001) 281.
3. C. D. Roberts and S. M. Schmidt, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **45** (2000) S1.
4. R. Alkofer and C. D. Roberts, Phys. Lett. B **369** (1996) 101.
5. D. Kekez, B. Bistrovic and D. Klabučar, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **14** (1999) 161.
6. D. Kekez and D. Klabučar, Phys. Lett. B **387** (1996) 14.
7. D. Klabučar and D. Kekez, Phys. Rev. D **58** (1998) 096003.
8. D. Kekez and D. Klabučar, Phys. Lett. B **457** (1999) 359;
see also arXiv:hep-ph/9905251, hep-ph/9907537, hep-ph/9909273.
9. D. Kekez, D. Klabučar and M. D. Scadron, J. Phys. G **26** (2000) 1335.
10. D. Klabučar, D. Kekez and M. D. Scadron, arXiv:hep-ph/0012267; published in “Rostock 2000/Trento 2001, Exploring quark matter,” p. 145.
11. D. Kekez and D. Klabučar, Phys. Rev. D **65** (2002) 057901.
12. B. Bistrovic and D. Klabučar, Phys. Lett. B **478**, 127 (2000).
(See also B. Bistrovic and D. Klabučar, Phys. Rev. D **61** (2000) 033006.)
13. P. Jain and H. J. Munczek, Phys. Rev. D **48** (1993) 5403.
14. D. Kekez, D. Klabučar and M. D. Scadron, J. Phys. G **27** (2001) 1775.
15. D. Kekez and D. Klabučar, Bled Workshops in Physics **3** (2002) 27;
arXiv:hep-ph/0212286.
16. Th. Feldmann, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **15** (2000) 159.
17. Th. Feldmann, P. Kroll and B. Stech, Phys. Rev. D **58** (1998) 114006.
18. Th. Feldmann, P. Kroll and B. Stech, Phys. Lett. B **449** (1999) 339.